arXiv:1510.03022v1 [math.RA] 11 Oct 20

Remarks on the Cayley-Hamilton theorem

L. Gatto I. Scherbak

Abstract

We revisit the classical theorem by Cayley and Hamilton, "*each endomorphism is a root of its own characteristic polynomial*", from the point of view of *Hasse–Schmidt derivations on an exterior algebra*.

1 Formulation of the Main Result

Let A be a commutative ring with unit, M a free A-module of rank r and $\bigwedge M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r} \bigwedge^j M$ its exterior algebra.

To any endomorphism f of M we associate (see Section 3) the unique A-module homomorphism

$$\mathbf{f}(t) : \bigwedge M \longrightarrow \bigwedge M[[t]], \quad \mathbf{f}(t) = \sum_{j\geqslant 0} f_j t^j, \quad f_j \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M),$$

such that

- $\mathbf{f}(t)(\alpha \wedge \beta) = \mathbf{f}(t)\alpha \wedge \mathbf{f}(t)\beta, \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in \bigwedge M;$
- $\mathbf{f}(t)_{|_M} = \mathbb{1}_M + \sum_{j\geqslant 1} f^j t^j,$

where $\mathbb{1}_M$ is the identity endomorphism of M.

Let

$$\det(\mathbb{1}_M t - f) = t^r - e_1 t^{r-1} + \ldots + (-1)^r e_r \tag{1}$$

be the characteristic polynomial of f. We prove, in Section 3, the following generalization of the Catyley-Hamilton theorem.

1.1 Theorem. *For each* $j = 1, \ldots, r$, *the sequence* $\{f_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ *satisfies the following* linear recurrent relation of order j,

$$f_{i+j}{}_{|_{\bigwedge^{r-j+1}M}} - e_1 f_{i+j-1}{}_{|_{\bigwedge^{r-j+1}M}} + \ldots + (-1)^j e_j f_i{}_{|_{\bigwedge^{r-j+1}M}} = 0,$$

for all $i \geqslant 0$.

Let $E_r(t) := \det(\mathbb{1}_M - ft)$. Using (1), we get explicitly

$$E_r(t) = 1 - e_1 t + \ldots + (-1)^r e_r t^r. \tag{2}$$

For each $i \geqslant 0$, define

$$U_i(f) = f_i - e_1 f_{i-1} + \ldots + (-1)^r e_r f_{i-r} \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M), \tag{3}$$

with the convention that $f_k = 0$ if $k < 0$.

1.2 Corollary. *We have*

$$f(t) = \frac{U_0(f) + U_1(f)t + \ldots + U_{r-1}(f)t^{r-1}}{E_r(t)}. \tag{4}$$

Moreover, for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$ *and* $\forall \alpha \in \bigwedge^{r-j+1} M$,

$$f(t)(\alpha) = \frac{U_0(f)(\alpha) + U_1(f)(\alpha)t + \ldots + U_{j-1}(f)(\alpha)t^{j-1}}{E_r(t)}.$$

1.3 Remark. In the case $j = r$, Theorem 1.1 gives

$$f_{i+j\,|_M} - e_1 f_{i+j-1\,|_M} + \ldots + (-1)^j e_j f_{i\,|_M} = 0, \ \forall i \geqslant 0.$$

Thus the sequence $\{f^k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$, where $f^0 := \mathbb{1}_M$, satisfies the linear recurrence relation of order r,

$$f^{i+r} - e_1 f^{i+r-1} + \ldots + (-1)^r e_r f^i = 0, \quad \forall i \geqslant 0.$$

This is the classic Cayley-Hamilton theorem.

1.4 If A contains the rational numbers, then the *formal Laplace transform* L sending series $\sum_{n\geqslant 0} a_n t^n$ to $\sum_{n\geqslant 0} a_n n! t^n$, is invertible, [2]. In this case we can make some additional observations.

Consider the series:

$$u_{-j}(t) := L^{-1}\left(\frac{t^j}{E_r(t)}\right) \in A[[t]], \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1,$$

which, as it was shown in [4], form an A-basis of solutions to the linear ODE

$$\begin{cases} y^{(r)}(t) - e_1 y^{(r-1)}(t) + \ldots + (-1)^r e_r y(t) = 0, \\ \\ y(t) \in A[[t]]. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Equality (4) then implies

$$\sum_{n\geqslant 0} f_n \frac{t^n}{n!} = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} U_j(f)u_{-j}(t). \tag{6}$$

1.5 Corollary. *If A is a $\mathbb{Q}$–algebra, then $\sum_{n\geqslant 0} f_n \frac{t^n}{n!}$ solves (5) in $\mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$.* ∎

By restricting (6) to M and recalling that $\sum_{n\geqslant 0} f^n \frac{t^n}{n!} = \exp(ft)$, one obtains the refinement by Leonard [5, 1996] and Liz [6, 1998] of Putzer's method [7, 1966] to compute the exponential of a complex valued square matrix.

1.6 Corollary. *If A is a $\mathbb{Q}$–algebra and $f \in \mathrm{End}_A(M)$ has the characteristic polynomial (1), then*

$$\exp(ft) = v_0(t)\mathbb{1}_M + v_1(t)f + \cdots + v_{r-1}(t)f^{r-1},$$

where $v_j(t)$ is the unique solution to (5) in $A[[t]]$ with the initial condition $v_j^{(i)}(t) = \delta_{ij}$, $0 \leqslant i, j \leqslant r-1$.

2 Derivations on Exterior Algebra

2.1 Preliminaries. (See [1, 3]) Fix an A-basis $b_0, \ldots, b_{r-1}$ of the ring M. Consider $\bigwedge M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r} \bigwedge^j M$, where $\bigwedge^0 M = A$, and $\bigwedge^j M$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant r$, is the A-module generated by $\{b_{i_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{i_j}\}$ with the relation:

$$b_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{i_{\sigma(j)}} = \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) b_{i_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{i_j}, \quad \sigma \in S_j,$$

where S_j denotes the permutation group on j elements. In particular, $\bigwedge^1 M = M$. The exterior algebra structure on $\bigwedge M$ is given by juxtaposition

$$\begin{cases} \wedge & : & \bigwedge^h M \times \bigwedge^k M & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge^{h+k} M, \\ & & (b_H, b_K) & \longmapsto & b_H \wedge b_K, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}_H := \mathfrak{b}_{i_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathfrak{b}_{i_h}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_K := \mathfrak{b}_{j_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathfrak{b}_{j_k}$ are monomials in $\bigwedge^h M$ and $\bigwedge^k M$ respectively.

Let t be an indeterminate over $\bigwedge M$ and denote by $\bigwedge M[[t]]$ and $\mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$ the corresponding rings of formal power series with coefficients in $\bigwedge M$ and $\mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)$ respectively. If $D(t) = \sum_{i\geqslant 0} D_i t^i$, $\tilde{D}(t) = \sum_{j\geqslant 0} \tilde{D}_j t^j \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$, their product is defined as:

$$D(t)\tilde{D}(t)\alpha = D(t)\sum_{j\geqslant 0} \tilde{D}_j\alpha\cdot t^j = \sum_{j\geqslant 0}(D(t)\tilde{D}_j\alpha)\cdot t^j, \ \ \forall \alpha \in \bigwedge M.$$

Given $D(t) \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$, we use the same notation for the induced A-homomorphism $D(t) : \bigwedge M \to \bigwedge M[[t]]$ mapping $\alpha \in \bigwedge M$ to $D(t)\alpha = \sum_{i\geqslant 0} D_i\alpha \cdot t^i \in \bigwedge M[[t]]$.

The formal power series $D(t) = \sum_{i\geqslant 0} D_i t^i$ is *invertible* in $\mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$ (i.e. there exists $\overline{D}(t) \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$ such that $D(t)\overline{D}(t) = \overline{D}(t)D(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\bigwedge M}$), if and only if D_0 is an automorphism of $\bigwedge M$. If $D(t)$ is invertible, we shall write its inverse as $\overline{D}(t) = \sum_{i\geqslant 0}(-1)^i\overline{D}_i t^i$. With this convention, $D(t)\overline{D}(t) = \overline{D}(t)D(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\bigwedge M}$ if and only if

$$\overline{D}_0 D_j - \overline{D}_1 D_{j-1} + \ldots + (-1)^j \overline{D}_j D_= = 0, \ \forall j \geqslant 1. \qquad (7)$$

2.2 Proposition *The following statements are equivalent:*

i) $D(t)(\alpha\wedge\beta) = D(t)\alpha \wedge D(t)\beta, \ \ \forall \alpha,\beta \in \bigwedge M$;

ii) $D_i(\alpha\wedge\beta) = \sum_{j=0}^{i} D_j\alpha \wedge D_{i-j}\beta, \ \ \forall i \geqslant 0$.

Proof. i)⇒ ii). By definition of $D(t)$, write i) as

$$\sum_{i\geqslant 0} D_i(\alpha\wedge\beta)t^i = \sum_{j_1\geqslant 0} D_{j_1}\alpha\cdot t^{j_1} \wedge \sum_{j_2\geqslant 0} D_{j_2}\beta\cdot t^{j_2}. \qquad (8)$$

Hence $D_i(\alpha\wedge\beta)$ is the coefficient of t^i on the right hand side of (8), which is $\sum_{j_1+j_2=i} D_{j_1}\alpha\wedge D_{j_2}\beta = \sum_{j=0}^{i} D_j\alpha\wedge D_{i-j}\beta$.

ii)⇒ i) We have

$$\begin{aligned} D(t)(\alpha\wedge\beta) &= \sum_{i\geqslant 0} D_i(\alpha\wedge\beta)t^i = \sum_{i\geqslant 0}\Big(\sum_{i_1+i_2=j} D_{i_1}\alpha\wedge D_{i_2}\beta\Big)t^i \\ &= \sum_{i_1\geqslant 0} D_{i_1}\alpha\cdot t^{i_1} \wedge \sum_{i_2\geqslant 0} D_{i_2}\beta\cdot t^{i_2} \\ &= D(t)\alpha\wedge D(t)\beta. \qquad \blacksquare \end{aligned} \qquad (9)$$

2.3 Definition. (Cf. [1]) *Let* $D(t) \in \mathrm{End}_A(\bigwedge M)[[t]]$. *The induced map* $D(t) : \bigwedge M \to \bigwedge M[[t]]$ *is called a* Hasse–Schmidt derivation on $\bigwedge M$ (HS-derivation *for short*), *if it satisfies the* (*equivalent*) *conditions of Proposition 2.2.*

We denote by $\mathsf{HS}(\bigwedge M)$ the set of all HS-derivation on $\bigwedge M$.

2.4 Remark. If $D(t) \in \mathsf{HS}(\bigwedge M)$, then D_1 is an A–derivation of $\bigwedge M$, i.e. the usual Leibniz's rule $D_1(\alpha \wedge \beta) = D_1\alpha \wedge \beta + \alpha \wedge D_1\beta$. holds.

2.5 Proposition. (Cf. [1, 3]) *The product of two* HS*-derivations is a* HS*-derivation. The inverse of a* HS*-derivation is a* HS*-derivation.*

Proof. For the product of HS-derivations $D(t)$ and $\tilde{D}(t)$, the statement i) of Proposition 2.2 holds:

$$\begin{aligned} D(t)\tilde{D}(t)(\alpha \wedge \beta) &= D(t)\Big(\sum_{j\geqslant 0}\sum_{j_1+j_2=j} \tilde{D}_{j_1}\alpha \wedge \tilde{D}_{j_2}\beta\Big)t^j \\ &= \sum_{j\geqslant 0}\sum_{j_1+j_2=j} D(t)D_{j_1}\alpha \cdot t^{j_1} \wedge D(t)D_{j_2}\beta \cdot t^{j_2} \\ &= D(t)\tilde{D}(t)\alpha \wedge D(t)\tilde{D}(t)\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\overline{D}(t)$, the inverse of the derivation $D(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}(t)(\alpha \wedge \beta) &= \overline{D}(t)(D(t)\overline{D}(t)\alpha \wedge D(t)\overline{D}(t)\beta) \\ &= (\overline{D}(t)D(t))(\overline{D}(t)\alpha \wedge \overline{D}(t)\beta) \\ &= \overline{D}(t)\alpha \wedge \overline{D}(t)\beta. \end{aligned}$$

■

The following property of HS-derivations on the exterior algebra was called in [3] the *integration by parts* formula.

2.6 Proposition. *If* $\overline{D}(t)$ *is the inverse of a derivation* $D(t)$, *then*

$$D(t)\alpha \wedge \beta = D(t)\alpha \wedge D(t)\overline{D}(t)\beta = D(t)(\alpha \wedge \overline{D}(t)\beta). \quad (10)$$

■

2.7 Remark. Equating the coefficients of t^j on the left and right hand sides of (10) gives an equivalent set of conditions: for any $j \geqslant 0$,

$$D_j\alpha\wedge\beta = D_j(\alpha\wedge\beta) - D_{j-1}(\alpha\wedge\overline{D}_1\beta) + \ldots + (-1)^j\alpha\wedge\overline{D}_j\beta. \quad (11)$$

2.8 Proposition. *For any* $g(t) = \sum_{j\geqslant 0} g_j t^j : M \to \bigwedge M[[t]]$ *there exists a unique* HS*-derivation* $D(g;t)$ *on* $\bigwedge M$ *such that* $D(g;t)_{|_M} = g(t)$.

Proof. For the chosen A-basis of the ring M (see the beginning of Section 2.1) we necessarily have $D(g;t)(b_j) = g(t)b_j$, $0 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1$. Hence, by Proposition 2.2 i), the action of $D(g;t)$ is uniquely defined on all the basis vectors of $\bigwedge M$:

$$D(g;t)(b_{i_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge b_{i_j}) = g(t)b_{i_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge g(t)b_{i_j}, \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant r. \quad (12)$$

■

3 Proof of the Main Results

Let $f \in \mathrm{End}_A(M)$. Denote by $\overline{f}(t) = \sum_{j\geqslant 0}(-1)^j\overline{f}_j t^j$ the unique HS-derivation of $\bigwedge M$ (see Proposition 2.8) extending

$$(\mathbb{1}_M - ft) : M \to M[t] \subseteq \bigwedge M[[t]].$$

3.1 Proposition. *For each* $i = 1, \ldots, r$*, the restriction of* $\overline{f}_j$ *to* $\bigwedge^i M$ *vanishes, for all* $j > i$.

Proof. Induction on i. For $i = 1$ the statement holds, by definition of $\overline{f}(t)$. Assume the statement true for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant i-1$, and consider $\alpha \in \bigwedge^i M$. Due to A-linearity, its enough to take $\alpha = m_1\wedge\ldots\wedge m_i$, where $m_1, \ldots, m_i \in M$. For $j > i$ we have, according to Proposition 2.2 ii),

$$\overline{f}_j(m_1\wedge\ldots\wedge m_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \overline{f}_k(m_1)\wedge\overline{f}_{j-k}(m_2\wedge\ldots\wedge m_{i-1}).$$

But each summand on the right hand side vanishes. Indeed, if $k = 0, 1$, then $j-k > i-1$ and by the induction hypothesis $\overline{f}_{j-k}(m_2\wedge\ldots\wedge m_{i-1}) = 0$. If $k \geqslant 2$, then $\overline{f}_k(m_1) = 0$. ■

In particular, $\overline{f}_j$ vanishes on the entire $\bigwedge M$, for $j > r$.

3.2 Corollary. $\overline{\mathbf{f}}(t) = \mathbb{1}_{\bigwedge M} - \overline{f}_1 t + \ldots + (-1)^r \overline{f}_r t^r$. ∎

Let $\mathbf{f}(t) = \sum_{j \geqslant 0} f_j t^j$ be the inverse HS-derivation of $\overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)$.

3.3 Proposition. *For each* $i \geqslant 1$, $f_i(m) = f^i(m), \forall m \in M$.

Proof. Induction on i. Notice that $f_1(m) = \overline{f}_1(m) = f(m)$. Now assume $f_k(m) = f^k(m)$, for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant i-1$. According to (7), we have

$$f_i(m) = \overline{f}_1 f_{i-1}(m) - \overline{f}_2 f_{i-2}(m) + \ldots + (-1)^{i-1} \overline{f}_i(m).$$

By the induction hypothesis, $f_k(m) \in M$ for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant i-1$, therefore Proposition 3.1 implies the vanishing of all terms on the right hand side, but the first one. Then

$$f_i(m) = \overline{f}_1 f_{i-1}(m) = \overline{f}_1(f^{i-1}(m)) = f(f^{i-1}(m)) = f^i(m). \quad ∎$$

Take the basis element $\zeta := b_0 \wedge b_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{r-1}$ of $\bigwedge^r M$ (see Section 2.1). It is unique up to the multiplication by an invertible in A. It is a common eigenvector of all of f_i and $\overline{f}_j$. Recall that $e_1, \ldots, e_r \in A$ stay for the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of f and of $E_r(t)$, see (1), (2). It turns out that they are eigenvalues of $\overline{f}_{i|_{\bigwedge^r M}}$.

3.4 Proposition. *We have* $\overline{f}_i(\zeta) = e_i \zeta$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.

Proof. Recall that $\overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)$ is the HS-derivation extending $\mathbb{1}_M - ft$. Hence, like in the proof of Proposition 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)(\zeta) &= \overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)(b_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{r-1}) \\ &= (\mathbb{1}_M - ft)\, b_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge (\mathbb{1}_M - ft)\, b_{r-1} \\ &= \det(\mathbb{1}_M - ft)\,(b_0 \wedge \ldots \wedge b_{r-1}) = \det(\mathbb{1}_M - ft)\,(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the eigenvalue of $\overline{f}_i$ on ζ is the coefficient of t^i in

$$\det(\mathbb{1}_M - ft) = E_r(t),$$

see (2). ∎

Define endomorphisms $U_i(\mathbf{f})$, $i \geqslant 0$, via the equality

$$E_r(t)\mathbf{f}(t) = \sum_{i \geqslant 0} U_i(\mathbf{f}) t^i. \tag{13}$$

Comparing the coefficients of t^i on the both sides gives the explicit formula (3).

3.5 Lemma. *We have* $U_j(\mathbf{f})\zeta = 0$ *for all* $j > 0$.

Proof. Denote by h_j the eigenvalue of f_j on ζ, and write

$$f_i(\zeta) = h_i\zeta, \quad \mathbf{f}(t)\zeta = H_r(t)\zeta, \quad H_r(t) = 1 + \sum_{j\geqslant 1} h_j t^j.$$

By construction, $E_r(t)H_r(t) = 1$. Equivalently, we get

$$h_j - e_1 h_{j-1} + \ldots + (-1)^j e_j = 0, \quad j \geqslant 1.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} U_j(\mathbf{f})\zeta &= (f_j - \sum_{i=1}^{r} (-1)^i e_j f_{j-i})\zeta \\ &= (h_j - e_1 h_{j-1} + \ldots + (-1)^j e_j)\zeta = 0. \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

3.6 Lemma. *We have*

$$U_i(\mathbf{f})\alpha \wedge \beta = \sum_{j=0}^{i} (-1)^j U_{i-j}(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge \overline{f}_j(\beta)). \tag{14}$$

Proof. According to definition (13), we write

$$\sum_{i\geqslant 0} (U_i(\mathbf{f})\alpha)t^i \wedge \beta = E_r(t)\mathbf{f}(t)\alpha \wedge \beta, \tag{15}$$

then apply integration by parts formula (10), and again use (13),

$$\begin{aligned} &= E_r(t)\mathbf{f}(t)(\alpha \wedge \overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)\beta)) = \sum_{i\geqslant 0} U_i(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge \overline{\mathbf{f}}(t)\beta)t^j \\ &= \sum_{i\geqslant 0} U_i(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge \sum_{j\geqslant 0} (-1)^j \overline{f}_j(\beta))t^{j+i} \\ &= \sum_{i\geqslant 0} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{i} U_{i-j}(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge (-1)^j \overline{f}_j(\beta)) \right) t^i. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Comparing the coefficients of t^i on the left hand side of (15) and the right hand side of (16) gives (14). $\blacksquare$

3.7 Proof of Theorem 1.1. We shall show that $\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})\alpha = 0$, for any $k \geqslant j$ and any $\alpha \in \bigwedge^{r-j+1} M$. For such α and for any $\beta \in \bigwedge^{j-1} M$, we have $\alpha \wedge \beta \in \bigwedge^{r} M$. Write $\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})\alpha \wedge \beta$, according to Lemma 3.6, as

$$\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge \beta) - \mathtt{U}_{k-1}(\mathbf{f})(\alpha \wedge \overline{f}_1(\beta)) + \ldots + (-1)^k \alpha \wedge \overline{f}_k(\beta).$$

We see that each term but the very last is zero, by Lemma 3.5. The very last term also is zero, by Proposition 3.1 as $k > j-1$. Since $\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})\alpha \wedge \beta = 0$ for any $\beta \in \bigwedge^{j} M$, then $\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})\alpha = 0$, for all $\alpha \in \bigwedge^{r-j+1} M$. Hence the statement holds. ∎

In particular $\mathtt{U}_j(\mathbf{f})$ vanishes on the entire exterior algebra $\bigwedge M$ for all $j \geqslant r$.

Now we restrict each $\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})$, $0 \leqslant k \leqslant r-1$, to M getting:

$$\mathtt{U}_k(\mathbf{f})_{|_M} = p_k(f) = f^k - e_1 f^{k-1} + \ldots + (-1)^k e_k.$$

Then (13) takes the form,

$$\sum_{j \geqslant 0} f^j t^j = \frac{\mathbb{1}_M + p_1(f)t + \ldots + (-1)^{r-1} p_{r-1}(f) t^{r-1}}{E_r(t)}. \qquad (17)$$

3.8 Proof of Corollary 1.6. Given a $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra A, the *formal Laplace transform* $L : A[[t]] \to A[[t]]$ and its inverse L^{-1} act as follows, see [2],

$$L \sum_{n \geqslant 0} a_n t^n = \sum_{n \geqslant 0} n! a_n t^n, \quad L^{-1} \sum_{n \geqslant 0} c_n t^n = \sum_{n \geqslant 0} c_n \frac{t^n}{n!}.$$

Consider

$$u_{-j} := L^{-1}\left(\frac{t^j}{E_r(t)}\right), \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1.$$

Applying L^{-1} to (17), we get the following expression for $\exp(ft)$,

$$\exp(ft) = u_0 + p_1(f)u_{-1} + \ldots + p_{r-1}(f)u_{-r+1}.$$

It will be convenient to re-write the series $u_0, u_{-1}, \ldots, u_{-r+1}$ in terms of

$$H_r(t) = \frac{1}{E_r(t)} = 1 + \sum_{j \geqslant 0} h_j t^j,$$

introduced in the proof of Lemma 3.5. We obtain

$$u_{-j} = L^{-1}(t^j H_r(t)) = \sum_{n \geqslant 0} h_{n-j} \frac{t^n}{n!}, \quad 0 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1.$$

According to [4], these series form an A-basis of solutions to the ODE (5) in $A[[t]]$. Hence $\exp(ft)$ solves this ODE in $A[[t]]$.

Take the *standard* A-basis of solutions, $\{v_j(t)\}_{0 \leqslant j \leqslant r-1}$, where $v_j(t)$ denotes the unique solution to (5) in $A[[t]]$ satisfying $v_j^{(i)}(t) = \delta_{ij}$, $0 \leqslant i, j \leqslant r-1$. In the standard basis, the coefficients are the initial conditions of the solution. In the case of $\exp(ft)$, these are $\mathbb{1}_M, f, \ldots, f^{r-1}$. ∎

References

[1] L. Gatto, *Schubert Calculus via Hasse–Schmidt Derivations*, Asian J. Math. **9**, No. 3, 315–322, (2005).

[2] L. Gatto, D. Laksov, *From linear recurrence relations to linear ODEs with constant coefficients*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications Vol. 15, No. 6 (2016) 1650109-1/ 1650109-23, doi:10.1142/S0219498816501097.

[3] L. Gatto, T. Santiago, *Schubert Calculus on a Grassmann Algebra*, Canad. Math. Bull. **52** (2009), no. 2, 200–212.

[4] L. Gatto, I. Scherbak, *"On One Property of One Solution of One Equation" or Linear ODE's, Wronskians and Schubert Calculus*, Moscow Math. J., to the seventy-fifth anniversary of V. I. Arnold, **12** (2012), No. 2, 275–291.

[5] I. H. Leonard, *The Matrix Exponential*, SIAM rev., Vol. **38**, No. 3, 1996, 507–512.

[6] E. Liz, *A Note on the Matrix Exponential*, SIAM Rev., Vol. **40**, No. 3, 1998, 700–702.

[7] E. J. Putzer, *Avoiding the Jordan canonical form in the discussion of linear systems with constant coefficients*, Amer. Math. Monthly **73**, 1966, 2–7.

Dip. di Scienze Matematiche
Politecnico di Torino, Italy
letterio.gatto@polito.it

School of Math. Sciences
Tel Aviv University, Israel
scherbak@post.tau.ac.il